

PHILLIP A. TALBERT  
Acting United States Attorney  
KATHERINE E. SCHUH  
Assistant United States Attorney  
2500 Tulare Street, Suite 4401  
Fresno, CA 93721  
Telephone: (559) 497-4000  
Facsimile: (559) 497-4099

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
United States of America

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
SAUL ONTIVEROS SOLIS,  
EDUARDO GARCIA  
  
Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:20-CR-00016-DAD-BAM

STIPULATION REGARDING EXCLUDABLE  
TIME PERIODS UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT;  
FINDINGS AND ORDER

DATE: December 8, 2021

TIME: 1:00 p.m.

COURT: Hon. Barbara A. McAuliffe

This case is set for a status conference on December 8, 2021. As set forth below, the parties now move, by stipulation, to continue the status conference to March 23, 2022, and to exclude the time period between December 8, 2021 and March 23, 2022 under the Speedy Trial Act.

On April 17, 2020, this Court issued General Order 617, which suspends all jury trials in the Eastern District of California scheduled to commence before June 15, 2020, and allows district judges to continue all criminal matters to a date after June 1. On May 13, 2020, this Court issued General Order 618, which suspends all jury trials in the Eastern District of California until further notice. These and previous General Orders were entered to address public health concerns related to COVID-19.

Although the General Orders address the district-wide health concern, the Supreme Court has emphasized that the Speedy Trial Act's end-of-justice provision "counteract[s] substantive openendedness with procedural strictness," "demand[ing] on-the-record findings" in a particular case. *Zedner v. United States*, 547 U.S. 489, 509 (2006). "[W]ithout on-the-record findings, there can be no

1 exclusion under” § 3161(h)(7)(A). *Id.* at 507. Moreover, any such failure cannot be harmless. *Id.* at  
 2 509; *see also United States v. Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1153 (9th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a  
 3 judge ordering an ends-of-justice continuance must set forth explicit findings on the record “either orally  
 4 or in writing”).

5 Based on the plain text of the Speedy Trial Act—which *Zedner* emphasizes as both mandatory  
 6 and inexcusable—General Orders 611, 612, and 617 require specific supplementation. Ends-of-justice  
 7 continuances are excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the basis of his findings that  
 8 the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the  
 9 defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is excludable unless  
 10 “the court sets forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or finding that the  
 11 ends of justice served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and  
 12 the defendant in a speedy trial.” *Id.*

13 The General Orders exclude delay in the “ends of justice.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code  
 14 T4). Although the Speedy Trial Act does not directly address continuances stemming from pandemics,  
 15 natural disasters, or other emergencies, this Court has discretion to order a continuance in such  
 16 circumstances. For example, the Ninth Circuit affirmed a two-week ends-of-justice continuance  
 17 following Mt. St. Helens’ eruption. *Furlow v. United States*, 644 F.2d 764 (9th Cir. 1981). The court  
 18 recognized that the eruption made it impossible for the trial to proceed. *Id.* at 767-68; *see also United*  
 19 *States v. Correa*, 182 F. Supp. 326, 329 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (citing *Furlow* to exclude time following the  
 20 September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and the resultant public emergency). The coronavirus is posing a  
 21 similar, albeit more enduring, barrier to the prompt proceedings mandated by the statutory rules.

22 In light of the societal context created by the foregoing, this Court should consider the following  
 23 case-specific facts in finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-  
 24 justice exception, § 3161(h)(7) (Local Code T4).<sup>1</sup> If continued, this Court should designate a new date  
 25 for the status conference. *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any  
 26 pretrial continuance must be “specifically limited in time”).

---

27  
 28 <sup>1</sup> The parties note that General Order 612 acknowledges that a district judge may make  
 “additional findings to support the exclusion” at the judge’s discretion. General Order 612, ¶ 5 (E.D.  
 Cal. March 18, 2020).

**STIPULATION**

Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendants, by and through defendants' counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:

1. By previous order, this matter was set for a status hearing on December 8, 2021.

2. By this stipulation, defendant now moves to continue the status conference until March 23, 2022, and to exclude time between December 8, 2021, and March 23, 2022, under Local Code T4.

3. The parties agree and stipulate, and request that the Court find the following:

a) The government has represented that the discovery associated with this case includes investigative reports, photographs, video recordings, audio records, and other investigative documents. All of this discovery has been either produced directly to counsel and/or made available for inspection and copying.

b) As a result of the public health emergency, defense counsel have limited access to their clients. Defense counsel require additional time to convey discovery to their clients, and to consult with and review discovery and other case matters with their clients.

c) Counsel for defendant believes that failure to grant the above-requested continuance would deny him/her the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

d) The government does not object to the continuance.

e) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by continuing the case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.

f) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period of December 8, 2021 to March 23, 2022, inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code T4] because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at defendant's request on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the

Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial must commence.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: December 1, 2021

PHILLIP A. TALBERT  
Acting United States Attorney

/s/ KATHERINE E. SCHUH  
KATHERINE E. SCHUH  
Assistant United States Attorney

Dated: December 1, 2021

/s/ VIRNA SANTOS  
VIRNA SANTOS  
Counsel for Defendant  
Saul Ontiveros Solis

Dated: December 1, 2021

/s/ KEVIN P. ROONEY  
KEVIN P. ROONEY  
Counsel for Defendant  
Eduardo Garcia

**ORDER**

IT IS SO ORDERED that the status conference is continued from December 8, 2021, to **March 23, 2022, at 1:00 p.m. before Magistrate Judge Barbara A. McAuliffe**. Time is excluded pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **December 1, 2021**

*/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe*  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE